



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 26, 2016

Mr. Robert W. Patterson
Open Records Coordinator
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2016-01919

Dear Mr. Patterson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 595364.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received six requests for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although the commission takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aetna Better Health of Texas, Inc.; Amerigroup Insurance Company ("Amerigroup"); Blue Cross Blue Shield of Texas ("BCBS"); Cook Children's Health Plan; Superior Healthplan; and United Healthcare Insurance Company. Accordingly, the commission states, and provides documentation showing, it notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Amerigroup and BCBS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 839 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at 841. BCBS states it has competitors. In addition, BCBS states release of its information would provide any competitor an unfair advantage. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find BCBS has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the commission may withhold BCBS’s information under section 552.104(a).¹

Amerigroup claims portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person that are privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Amerigroup contends portions of its information are confidential under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Amerigroup has established a *prima facie* case its customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent Amerigroup’s customer information is not publicly available on its website, the commission must withhold Amerigroup’s customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find Amerigroup has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Amerigroup demonstrated the

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company’s] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Amerigroup also claim portions of its information are protected under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Amerigroup has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would likely result from the release of any of the remaining information, including any customer information that is publicly available on Amerigroup's website. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception under the Act). Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the commission may withhold BCBS's information under section 552.104 of the Government Code. To the extent Amerigroup's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the commission must withhold Amerigroup's customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The commission must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/akg

Ref: ID# 595364

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 6 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen R. Ford
Amerigroup Insurance
4425 Corporation Lane
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert F. Johnson
For Blue Cross Blue Shield of Texas
Gardere
600 Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Leah Rummel
UnitedHealthcare Insurance
14141 SW Freeway
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Holly Munin
Superior Healthplan
2100 South IH-35, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78704
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Watkins
Cook Children's Health Plan
P.O. Box 2488
Fort Worth, Texas 76113
(w/o enclosures)